



Town of Carlisle

MASSACHUSETTS 01741

Office of
PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

MARCH 8, 1982

PRESENT: Coulter, Hannaford, Kulmala, Sillers, Chaput, and Raftery

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 P.M. The minutes of the February 22, 1982 meeting were approved as submitted.

Public Hearing: Wetland Special Permit, Sunset Road, Charles Spidle

The hearing was opened at 8:15 P.M.

Mr. Spidle spoke in favor of his application for a Special Permit under Section 5.B.6 of the Zoning Bylaws and represented that he had received his order of conditions from the Conservation Commission. A comment was made by Edward Bing that the area is subject to road water run-off and such run-off could lead to salt contamination of the well, if any, placed on the lot. It was pointed out that the septic system appeared to be eleven (11) feet from the road. A question was raised as to setbacks for septic systems. Mr. Spidle represented that CV&P has approved the plan. Mr. Bing raised the issue of the number of houses on Sunset Road surpassing the subdivision regulation which limits the length and number of houses on a dead end street. It was explained to him by the Board that the 15 house limitation and the 1000 foot rule reflects an average in Town and Sunset Road was a road considered above that average at the time.

The public hearing closed at 8:44 P.M.

Kris Nelson answered the question "What setback ^{from the street} must a leeching field have?" with "Ten feet". Nevertheless, the Board decided to telephone Patricia Cutter, i.e., the Board of Health, which it did and elicited the answer "Ten feet". On February 24, 1982 the Board of Health approved the plan.

Motion to Approve Application

Tom Raftery made a motion to approve the application; seconded by Kay Kulmala. The Board then found that:

1. The proposed use will not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare, and will be in harmony with

the general purpose and intent of the Bylaw;

2. The proposed use will comply in all respects with the provisions of the Bylaw that are applicable to the underlying district within which the land is located; and
3. The data and plan accompanying the application show that the land is not unsuitable for the proposed use.

The motion passed 5-1. Mrs. Chaput voted against expressing a concern as to proximity of the dwelling to the wetland.

Common Driveway Applications: McColgan and Young

McColgan: Presentation by Kris Nelson. The maintenance agreement was not in the application but a copy was presented. This has not been presented to the Conservation Commission yet. Gravel surface will be used; only two lots served. The proposed driveway nears the Rolando lot line as close as 11 feet. House on Rolando property is 70 feet away through a 50-foot pine grove. Mr. McColgan represented he intended to screen Booth property with arbor vitae or something. There may be a wooden guardrail on the drive. A final proposed agreement will be forwarded. (The public hearing is scheduled for 7:30 P.M. on April 12, 1982.)

Young: Kris Nelson presented a plan to serve three (3) lots with a 12-foot wide gravel driveway. Fifty feet of common drive is within 100 feet of the wetlands. (Coulter expressed awe at the ability of an engineer to draw a lot so as to provide an area outside 100 feet of a wetland for the leeching field and septic tank and just enough area within 100 feet of a wetland to locate the dwelling site.) Length of common drive is 850 feet. It was expressed that no other lots will connect to this proposed driveway. Stearns Street is about 100 feet away centerline to centerline. An application for dwelling site and driveway to Conservation Commission has been or will be made together. It was suggested that the driveway location choice may not be desirable because of sightlines available to oncoming traffic on Bedford Road. It was suggested that Board members view the area; 4-foot green (fluorescent) stakes will be located at highway connection for us to view.

OSRD Discussion

Vivian Chaput attended the Conservation Commission meeting last week to explain the proposed bylaw. Conscom wanted lots which could have been built to be percolated, etc. to show that lots could, in fact, have been built upon so that paper lots are not traded for building lots. Other points raised were stringent requirements to be within the bylaw; too much flexibility; procedure for issuing permit; and, criteria list from OS&R Report should be in purposes section. Discussion ensued. March 22, 1982 will see informal discussion at regular meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas J. Raftery